

MSc in Neuroscience  
Head of Study  
Course leaders and student representatives on 1st semester



## MINUTES

15 FEBRUARY 2024

**Forum** Evaluation meeting MSc in Neuroscience, 1<sup>st</sup> semester

**STUDENT AFFAIRS**

**Meeting held** 14 February 2024, 08:30 – 09:45

**Place**

BLEGDAMSVEJ 3  
2200 KØBENHAVN N

**Minutes-taker** Jørgen Willadsen

DIR 45 35 32 74 92

**Present**

**Student representatives:** Caitriona Lauren Organ.

jwi@sund.ku.dk

**Course leaders:** Birgitte Rahbek Kornum (BRK) and Ole Kiehn (OK)

**Head of Study:** Jens Holm Mikkelsen (JHM).

REF: JWI

**Not present:** Student representatives: Emma Mollerup, and Sigurd Fyhn Sørensen.

## Agenda

1. Welcome and introduction to the meeting
2. Evaluation of Neuroscience I - Cells and circuits
3. Evaluation of Experimental design in Neuroscience
4. Evaluation of the total semester
5. Other

### Ad 1) Welcome and introduction to the meeting

This is the fourth or the fifth time we do the evaluation. We can see if points are redundant from previous years. The meeting minutes will be presented to the Study board and take part of the annual report that JHM is writing to the dean about the status of the

educational programme.

PAGE 2 OF 4

Ad 2) **Evaluation of Neuroscience I - Cells and circuits**

Course leader: Ole Kiehn

**Good, well-functioning elements to be maintained**

- General satisfaction with the course
- The diversity of the different lecturers
- Interesting topics.

**Elements that need attention before the course is offered again**

- Some repetition could be avoided on the basic knowledge, even though it was beneficial for students who haven't any background in neuroscience
- The thematic report could be explained better e.g. workload, importance, use of supervisor, that it is okay to have online meetings with the supervisor. It was good to be able to work on the report over a longer period. OK: The report weighs 2,5 ECTS that equals 7-10 days of work. You get it early so you can work on it over a longer period. The intention is that you interact with a researcher. We can communicate better about the workload next time. JHM: We can ask the supervisors to be more active in their communication with the students
- Better alignment in the learning objectives on Absalon between the different lecturers. Some were very detailed and others broader. That made it confusing for the students on what to focus on and caused some panic for anxious students. OK: They should be somewhat broad, so we will look at it and remove the very specific ones. The student representatives will send some examples to OK. On the other hand, the learning goals were very helpful for the students, so please keep them.

**Problems that need to be improved before the course is offered again**

- Workload management – the wide spread of topics made some students not attend the Journal Clubs. They prioritised to use the time on more exam relevant teaching
- Time table between the two first semester courses could be better e.g. not having more Journal Clubs after each other in both courses
- A request to change the order of the exams for the two courses. OK and BRK agreed on that and will change that for next year. This will give students more time in January to prepare for the exam in Neuroscience I.

### Ad 3) **Evaluation of Experimental design in Neuroscience**

Course leader: Birgitte Rahbek Kornum

#### **Good, well-functioning elements to be maintained**

- Exam method - especially after the Q&A session it got clear. BRK: I will try to explain the exam form better next time and maybe have a mock exam to take away some of the anxiousness from students who have never done an oral exam before
- The pace of the individual lecturers
- The Journal Clubs were good and beneficial learning experience even though some find it very challenging. It is a beneficial learning for now and for professional situations later.

#### **Elements that need attention before the course is offered again**

- A request to ensure that all students have the necessary possibilities to understand the papers presented. Students have different backgrounds and levels. BRK: We could maybe have some basic material on Absalon, something fundamental on the different lectures. We could also label the lectures whether they are fundamental or not, so students who already have a good understanding can choose to prioritise time differently.

#### **Problems that need to be improved before the course is offered again**

- Time table could be better – some weeks were packed with lectures and others had none. BRK: It can be better, and we will change it
- A request to ensure a better alignment in the level of difficulty in the papers. Some students were anxious to get a complicated paper to present at the exam. A big gap between the level of a paper and the level of understanding
- A wish for the external lecturers to have the necessary information about the level of the students, and what is relevant for students for the exam. BRK: I have asked the students to rate the lecturers, so I have a good idea about how to address and talk to
- A wish to have the exam Q&A session earlier.

### Ad 4) **Evaluation of the total semester**

- Repetition – if the whole class finds learnings redundant JHM encouraged the students to inform the given teachers so they can

coordinate internally or inform the course responsible.

PAGE 4 OF 4

**Ad 5) Other**

Nothing to report.